

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JEFFREY S. PATERSON,)	3:11-cv-00845-HDM-WGC
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS</u>
)	
vs.)	November 5, 2013
)	
STATE OF NEVADA, ex rel, NEVADA)	
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,)	
<i>et. al.</i> ,)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: Katie Lynn Ogden REPORTER: FTR

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF: Jeffrey S. Paterson, In Pro Per (Telephonically)

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): Nathan Hastings, Esq, (Telephonically)

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS: Status Conference

1:30 p.m. Court convenes.

The court addresses the parties regarding the purpose of this hearing. The court notes this case has been pending since 2011. The court has been advised by the Chambers of Senior District Judge Howard McKibben that it is the intention of the court to set trial in this matter in early 2014. The court reminds the parties of the recently filed Scheduling Order (Doc. # 84) with a discovery cut-off deadline of January 22, 2014. The parties are informed that it is unlikely the court will favorably receive requests for extension(s) of time regarding discovery.

The court turns to Plaintiff's "Motion for Relief (Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(3))" (Doc. # 82). Plaintiff briefly discusses his intention for filing his motion for relief.

In response to Plaintiff's statements, the court makes note of several concerns it has with regard to Plaintiff's motion for relief. First, Plaintiff's motion for relief, which in its content appears to voice some type of discovery dispute, would probably be better suited if it were filed and pursued as a motion to compel. The court advises Plaintiff that a motion to compel is a discovery motion which would require the parties to first attempt to resolve the discovery dispute prior to bringing a motion to compel before the court. Counsel for Defendants indicates that to the extent possible, he would cooperate with Plaintiff with regard to discovery.

By: /s/
Katie Lynn Ogden, Deputy Clerk